



University of Warwick institutional repository: <http://go.warwick.ac.uk/wrap>

This paper is made available online in accordance with publisher policies. Please scroll down to view the document itself. Please refer to the repository record for this item and our policy information available from the repository home page for further information.

To see the final version of this paper please visit the publisher's website. Access to the published version may require a subscription.

Author(s): Kay, William K.; Francis, Leslie J.; Robbins, Mandy

Article Title: A Distinctive Leadership for a Distinctive Network of Churches? Psychological Type Theory and the Apostolic Networks

Year of publication: 2011

Link to published article:

[http://dx.doi.org/ 10.1163/174552511X597170](http://dx.doi.org/10.1163/174552511X597170)

Publisher statement: Copyright 2011 Brill.

A distinctive leadership for a distinctive network of churches? Psychological type theory and  
the apostolic networks

William K Kay\*

Glyndŵr University, UK

Leslie J Francis

and

Mandy Robbins

University of Warwick, UK

Author note:

\*Corresponding author:

William K Kay

Glyndŵr University,

Plas Coch Campus,

Mold Road, Wrexham,

Wales LL11 2AW

UK

Email: [william.kay@trinity.oxon.org](mailto:william.kay@trinity.oxon.org)

**Abstract**

This study compares the personality profile of male leaders connected with twelve apostolic networks of churches in the UK with the profile of Church of England clergymen. It makes a further comparison with the UK population norms. Data provided by 164 male apostolic network leaders demonstrated that, compared with the Church of England clergymen, they were more likely to prefer extraversion and less likely to prefer intuition. Compared with the UK male population norms, these leaders were more likely to prefer extraversion, intuition, feeling and judging. The implications of these findings are discussed for ministry and mission.

*Keywords: Psychological type, Pentecostal, clergy, apostolic networks, Francis*

*Psychological Type Scales*

## Introduction

There are numerous ways of analysing and describing human personality. In most of these ways human personality is not viewed deterministically but as a method of describing tendencies and predispositions. Psychodynamic or 'depth' personality theories conceive of the mind and emotions of individuals as being part of the single complex system of forces going back into childhood. Simpler personality theories, some of which are more concerned with behaviour than motivation, describe personality in terms of preferences, habits or traits. Theories of this kind may arrange the attributes of personality on a series of continua or organise the descriptive process by reference to types. Although there are theoretical arguments in both directions, the least contentious way of judging a personality theory is by reference to its usefulness and its widespread applicability. In this paper we make use of a model of personality known as psychological type theory that operates by reference to four pairs of functions.

These pairs are two orientations (extraversion *or* introversion), two perceiving processes (sensing *or* intuition), the two judging processes (thinking *or* feeling), and the two attitudes toward the outer world (judging *or* perceiving). Although psychological type theory is concerned with the configuration of these four sets of contrasting characteristics of 16 discrete psychological types and with the dynamic interaction of the component parts within these 16 types, the four sets of contrasting characteristics can also be considered separately and in their own right.

Although originally conceived as a psychological theory, derived first in clinical practice and subsequently in the psychological tradition of personality and individual differences, psychological type theory has been rediscovered as a theological theory, integrated within a broader conceptualisation of a theology of individual differences. For example, Francis (2005) rooted the notion of a theology of individual differences within a

strong doctrine of creation and a distinctive reading of Genesis 1:27. This strong doctrine of creation distinguished between those human characteristics that properly reflect the intentionality of the divine creator and those characteristics (like immoral behaviour) that more properly reflect the corruption of the fall. This reading of Genesis 1:27 affirms that sex differences reflect both the divine intention and the divine image. Similarly, Francis (2005) argued that ethnic difference should be seen to reflect both the divine intention and the divine image. He also argued that psychological type should be seen in an analogous way: it stems from the divine intention and the divine image.

This understanding of human psychological type as a God-given feature of our lives can be placed alongside our understanding of the working of the Holy Spirit within the life of a believer in the context of the church. We can begin to construct a model of Christian functioning that centres on the interaction between the Holy Spirit and the psychological type of the believer. Francis (2005) and Kay (2000, 2001) have both investigated the role of personality within the life of the church. Kay, using a sample of 930 classical Pentecostal ministers in Britain, has been able to show that prophetic gifts are associated with extravert personalities (p. 280). This is by no means a surprising finding when one considers the socially risky process of bringing a prophetic utterance to the congregation. Not only is the utterance liable to judgement (1 Cor 14.29) but also, given that such utterances are normally impromptu, the speaker must be prepared to launch out into the unknown. Moreover, this interactive model is able to distinguish between *manifestations of* the Holy Spirit and *reactions to* the Holy Spirit, the first being seen in charismatic gifts and the second being seen in open displays of emotion in praise, repentance or worship.

### **Previous type studies**

Psychological type theory, as originally proposed by Carl Jung (1971; first published in English in 1921) and operationalised and developed through a series of self-report type

indicators or type scales (Myers & McCaulley, 1985; Keirsey & Bates, 1978), has become an increasingly useful tool within the fields of empirical theology, practical theology, and pastoral theology. The theory has been employed to illuminate Christian reflection on prayer (Michael & Norrissey, 1984; Keating, 1987; Duncan, 1993), ministry and leadership (Oswald & Kroeger, 1988), Christian growth (Goldsmith & Wharton, 1993), Christian communication (Butler, 1999), preaching (Francis & Atkins, 2000; 2001; 2002; Francis & Village, 2008), and congregations (Edwards, 1993; Baab, 1998).

The development of instruments capable of measuring or assessing psychological type, like the Myers Briggs Type Indicator (Myers & McCaulley, 1985), the Keirsey Temperament Sorter (Keirsey & Bates, 1978) and the Francis Psychological Type Scales (Francis, 2005), have enabled a clear profile to be compiled of the population as a whole against which specific subgroups of the population can be located. In the United Kingdom the population profile has been published by Kendall (1998) on the basis of data provided by samples of 865 women and 748 men.

Working from this starting point, a series of studies has begun to build up a semi-coordinated attempt to illuminate the psychological type profile of religious professionals within the United Kingdom. These studies include Presbyterian Church of Scotland ministers (Irvine, 1989), Bible College students (Francis, Penson, & Jones, 2001), evangelical church leaders (Francis & Robbins, 2002; Craig, Francis, & Robbins, 2004), missionary personal (Craig, Horsfall, & Francis, 2005), evangelical lay church leaders (Francis, Craig, Horsfall, & Ross, 2005), Roman Catholic priests (Craig, Duncan, & Francis, 2006), youth ministers (Francis, Nash, Nash, & Craig, 2007), evangelical Anglican seminarians (Francis, Craig, & Butler, 2007), Assemblies of God theological college students (Kay, Francis, & Craig, 2008; Kay & Francis, 2008), leaders within the Newfrontiers network of churches (Francis, Gubb, & Robbins, 2009; Ryland, Francis, & Robbins, in press), and Anglican clergy serving in

Wales (Francis, Payne, & Jones, 2001) and in England (Francis, Craig, Whinney, Tilley, & Slater, 2007; Francis, Robbins, Duncan, Whinney, & Ross, in press). These last two studies, based respectively on samples of 626 and 622 clergymen serving in the Church of England, provide a particularly fascinating and authoritative snapshot of how this particular group of male religious professionals differs in psychological type terms from the male population as a whole. Attention will now be focused on these differences, beginning with the perceiving process since it is here that the difference is most pronounced.

The two perceiving functions are concerned with the way in which people gather information. On the one hand, sensing types (S) focus on the realities of a situation as perceived by the senses. They tend to focus on specific details, rather than on the overall picture. They are concerned with the actual, the real, and the practical; they tend to be down to earth and matter of fact. On the other hand, intuitive types (N) focus on the possibilities of a situation, perceiving meanings and relationships. They may feel that perception by the senses is not as valuable as information gained from the unconscious mind as indirect associations and concepts impact on their perception. They focus on the overall picture, rather than on specific facts and data. Kendall (1998) demonstrated that the male population in the UK was heavily weighted with a preference for sensing (73%) and that the female population in the UK was even more weighted in this direction (79%). The two studies of Anglican clergymen, however, demonstrated very different profiles with preference for intuition being displayed by 62% and 67% of the clergymen. This preference for intuition among Anglican clergymen is explicable in terms of their concern with abstract theological principles, in terms of their commitment to an invisible deity, and in terms of their attraction to the imaginative and sometimes elusive application of faith to practice. At the same time, this strong intuitive profile may render Anglican clergymen somewhat inaccessible to the majority of men who prefer sensing and who may see clergymen as impracticable, and

unrealistic, with their heads in the clouds and their feet rarely touching the ground.

The two judging functions are concerned with the criteria which people employ to make decisions and judgments. On the one hand, thinking types (T) make decisions and judgments based on objective, impersonal logic. They value integrity and justice. They are known for their truthfulness and for their desire for fairness. They consider conforming to principles to be of more importance than cultivating harmony. For thinkers impersonal objectivity is more important than interpersonal relationships. For them the mind is more important than the heart. On the other hand, feeling types (F) make decisions and judgments based on subjective, personal values. They value compassion and mercy. They are known for their tactfulness and for their desire for peace. They are more concerned to promote harmony, than to adhere to abstract principles. For feelers interpersonal relationships are more important than impersonal objectivity. For them the heart is more important than the mind. Kendall (1998) demonstrated that the male population in the UK was heavily weighted with a preference for thinking (65%) while the female population in the UK was heavily weighted with a preference for feeling (70%). In other words, within the population as a whole feeling is profiled as a feminine characteristic, while thinking is profiled as a masculine characteristic. The two studies of Anglican clergymen, however, demonstrate a very different profile from men in general, with a preference for feeling being displayed by 54% and 56% of the clergymen. This preference for feeling among Anglican clergymen is explicable in terms of their concern with the human dimensions of the Christian gospel, in terms of their commitment to modelling a religious community committed to harmony and peace, and in terms of the valuing of feminine characteristics of gentleness, empathy, and acceptance. At the same time, their strong feeling profile may render Anglican clergymen somewhat inaccessible to the majority of men who prefer thinking and who may see clergymen as soft, as too feminine, and as lacking tough decisiveness, with their hearts ruling their heads.



The two attitudes toward the outer world are determined by which of the two sets of functions (that is, perceiving S/N, or judging T/F) is preferred in dealing with the outer world. On the one hand, judging types (J) seek to order, rationalise, and structure their outer world, as they actively judge external stimuli. They enjoy routine and established patterns. They prefer to follow schedules in order to reach an established goal and may make use of lists, timetables, or diaries. They tend to be punctual, organised, and tidy. They prefer to make decisions quickly and to stick to their conclusions once made. On the other hand, perceiving types (P) do not seek to impose order on the outer world, but are more reflective, perceptive, and open, as they passively perceive external stimuli. They have a flexible open-ended approach to life. They enjoy change and spontaneity. They prefer to leave projects open in order to adapt and improve them. Their behaviour may often seem impulsive and unplanned. Kendall (1998) demonstrated that the male population in the UK was weighted with preference for judging (55%), and that the female population in the UK was even more weighted in this direction (62%). The two studies of Anglican clergymen demonstrated an even stronger preference for judging, being displayed by 68% and 73% of the clergymen. This preference for judging among Anglican clergymen is explicable in terms of their concern for living in an ordered and disciplined way, in terms of their commitment to a daily pattern of prayer, and in terms of the structured liturgical shape of Anglican worship. At the same time, this strong judging profile may render Anglican clergymen somewhat inaccessible to the sizable minority of men (45%) who prefer perceiving and who may see clergymen as too rigid, too inflexible, and far too staid to be fun and fully human.

The two orientations are concerned with where energy is drawn from and focused. On the one hand, extraverts (E) are orientated toward the outer world; they are energised by the events and people around them. They enjoy communicating and thrive in stimulating and exciting environments. They tend to focus their attention on what is happening outside

themselves. They are usually open people, easy to get to know, and enjoy having many friends. Introverts (I), on the other hand, are orientated toward their inner world; they are energised by their inner ideas and concepts. They enjoy solitude, silence, and contemplation, as they tend to focus their attention on what is happening in their inner life. They may prefer to have a small circle of intimate friends rather than many acquaintances. Kendall (1998) demonstrated that the male population in the UK was weighted with a preference for introversion (53%), while the female population in the UK was weighted with a preference for extraversion (57%). The two studies of Anglican clergymen demonstrated a stronger preference for introversion than that displayed by the male population, being displayed by 57% and 64% of the clergymen. This preference for introversion among Anglican clergymen is explicable in terms of the emphasis in Anglican spirituality on quiet reflection and solitude, in terms of the (largely) non-participating theatre of Anglican liturgy, and in terms of an emphasis on ministry to individuals. At the same time, their clear introverted profile may render Anglican clergymen somewhat inaccessible to the sizable minority of men (47%) and the majority of women (57%) who prefer extraversion and who may see clergymen as too withdrawn, too reflective, and too inaccessible to command their attention and to capture their respect.

While this profile of Anglican clergymen in England provides a clear contrast with the male population profile, other studies conducted among different groups of religious professionals demonstrate that there are variations according to church traditions and according to theological emphases. For example, an interesting contrast with the profile of Anglican clergymen is provided by the study of 190 male students attending the British Assemblies of God theological college (Kay, Francis, & Craig, 2008). While between 62% and 67% of Anglican clergymen preferred intuition, the proportion fell to 26% among male Assemblies of God students. While between 54% and 56% of Anglican clergymen preferred

feeling, the proportion fell to 44% among male Assemblies of God students. While between 68% and 73% of Anglican clergymen preferred judging, the proportion fell to 65% among male Assemblies of God students. While between 57% and 64% of Anglican clergymen preferred introversion, the proportion fell to 48% among male Assemblies of God students. Clearly church traditions and theological emphases may be important in shaping the profile of religious professionals and in nuancing the gap between religious professionals and the male population as a whole.

The study reported by Kay, Francis and Craig (2008) profiled students attending a theological college associated with Assemblies of God in Britain. The aim of the present study is to build on this research and to extend it to the new generation of neo-Pentecostal Churches as represented by the latest apostolic networks. There are around 12 of these networks in the UK and most of them had their origins in the 1970s. They may be seen as the radical wing of the charismatic movement or as neo-Pentecostal in the sense that their doctrines concerning the Holy Spirit are usually similar to those of the classical denominational Pentecostals. They avoid the machinery of denominationalism (especially committees of any kind) and form their ecclesiology round a recognition of 'ministry gifts', especially modern day apostles, prophets and evangelists. As a consequence most of the networks have been focused upon the practical business of church planting and mission (Kay, 2002, 2007, 2008, 2009). The two hypotheses being tested in this paper are that this relatively new, and still emerging, stream of churches attract a leadership that displays a type profile significantly different from that found among leaders in the Anglican Church; and that the leadership within this relatively new, and still emerging stream, of churches displays a type profile significantly different from UK men in general.

## **Method**

### **Procedure**

A database of names and postal addresses of the leaders of 647 churches associated with the apostolic networks was compiled. The leaders were mailed the anonymous and confidential survey along with a return postage-paid envelope and covering letter. A total of 237 questionnaires were returned, making a response rate of 36.6%. Of these returned questionnaires 164 were from male leaders who had thoroughly completed the measure of psychological type included in the survey.

### **Instrument**

*Psychological type* was assessed by the Francis Psychological Type Scales (FPTS: Francis, 2005). This 40-item instrument comprises four sets of ten forced-choice items related to each of the four components of psychological type: orientation (extraversion or introversion), perceiving process (sensing or intuition), judging process (thinking or feeling), and attitude toward the outer world (judging or perceiving). Recent studies have demonstrated this instrument to function well in church-related contexts. For example, Francis, Craig, and Hall (2008) reported alpha coefficients of .83 and for EI scale, .76 for the SN scale, .73 for the TF scale, and .79 for the JP scale.

### **Sample**

Of the 164 men who completed the Francis Psychological Type Scales, 2% were in their 20s, 16% were in their 30s, 36% were in their 40s, 37% were in their 50s, 9% were in their 60s, and 1% were aged 70 or over.

### **Data analysis**

The scientific literature concerned with psychological type has developed a distinctive way of presenting type-related data. The conventional format of ‘type tables’ has been used in the present paper to allow the findings from this study to be compared with other relevant studies in the literature. In these tables the psychological type profiles of the male leaders within churches associated with the apostolic networks are compared first with the profile of

Anglican clergymen as reported by Francis, Craig, Whinney, Tilley, and Slater (2007) and then with the norms for the United Kingdom male population as reported by Kendall (1998). The statistical significance of differences between the present sample and the population norms and the Anglican clergy are tested by means of the Selection Ratio Index (*I*), an extension of the classic chi-square test.

To read the tables at the end of this paper, look first at the left hand side of the page. Here it is possible to see how many leaders in the apostolic networks sample fall into each of the 16 types by looking at the *n*. Thus *n* = 18 means that 18 people in the sample fall into that particular category. Then, on the right hand side of the page and at the bottom, the *I* ratio is given. This number records the result of a comparison between the networks sample and the sample of male Anglican clergy (table 1) or the male UK population (table 2). The percentages of people in each of the 16 types in the comparison group are not given in a separate table; they are included in the prose commentary. However, the *I* ratio gives you the information you really need. If *I* equals 1.0 then there is no difference between the comparison group and the sample used in this paper. If *I* is substantially above or below 1.0, then there is a statistically significant difference between this sample and the comparison group, and the level of this significance is given by the number of asterisks (\*) which are displayed adjacently.

## Results

Table 1 presents the psychological type profile of the 164 male leaders of churches associated with the apostolic networks. These data demonstrate a clear preference for extraversion (70%) over introversion (30%), a clear preference for judging (73%) over perceiving (27%), a balance between sensing (51%) and intuition (49%), and a balance between thinking (48%) and feeling (52%). In terms of dominant types, there is a broad balance, with 29% dominant thinkers, 29% dominant feelers, 24% dominant sensors, and

19% dominant intuitives. The three most frequently occurring types were ENFJ (15%), ESTJ (13%) and ENTJ (12%), followed by ISTJ (11%) and ESFJ (10%).

Table 1 also takes the analysis of the data one step further by comparing the psychological type profile of the 164 male leaders of churches associated with the apostolic networks with the psychological type profile of 626 Anglican clergymen reported by Francis, Craig, Whinney, Tilley, and Slater (2007). In terms of the four binary sets of functions, there are two highly significant differences between the two groups of religious professionals. The male leaders of apostolic networks are *more likely to prefer extraversion* (70% compared with 43% of Anglican clergymen) and *less likely to prefer intuition* (49% compared with 62% of Anglican clergymen). On the other hand, comparable levels of preference were shown by the two groups of religious professionals for thinking (48% in the apostolic networks and 46% in the Anglican Church) and for judging (73% in the apostolic networks and 68% in the Anglican Church). In terms of dominant types, the significant difference between the two groups of religious professionals occurs in respect of intuition. While 29% of the Anglican clergymen emerged as dominant intuitives, the proportion fell to 19% among the apostolic network leaders. In terms of temperaments, the significant difference between the two groups of religious professionals occurs in respect of the SJ preference. While 31% of the Anglican clergymen emerged as SJs, the proportion rose to 42% among the apostolic network leaders.

Table 2 completes the analysis of the data by comparing the psychological type profile of the 164 male leaders of churches associated with the apostolic networks with the psychological type profile of the UK male population reported by Kendall (1998). Significant differences emerged in terms of the four binary sets of functions, with the network leaders being *more likely to prefer extraversion* (70% compared with 47% of the male population), *intuition* (49% compared with 27% of the male population), *feeling* (52% compared with 35% of the male population), and *judging* (73% compared with 55% of the male population).

In terms of dominant types, the network leaders were more likely to be dominant feeling (29% compared with 15% of the male population), more likely to be dominant intuitive (19% compared with 13% of the male population), and less likely to be dominant sensing (24% compared with 41% of the male population). Similar proportions of religious professionals (29%) and the male population (31%) were dominant thinking.

### **Conclusion**

The present study set out to establish the psychological type profile of male leaders of churches associated with the apostolic networks. It found that this relatively new and still emerging stream of churches is attracting a leadership with a pattern of personality that is significantly different from the pattern found among leaders in the Anglican Church. It also found that the leaders within this relatively new and still emerging stream of churches display a type profile significantly different from that found in men in general. Four main conclusions emerge from this study.

First, the leaders associated with the apostolic networks are significantly more extraverted and significantly more sensing than their Anglican counterparts. The new leaders are more energised by and more engaged with the outer world, whether this is the physical world or the social world. Here are leaders who are more concerned with the practical rather than with the theoretical or theological aspects of ministry.

Second, the extraverted tendency of leaders associated with the apostolic networks is beneficial to them in the manifestation of charismatic gifts. The exercise of such gifts, as we have said, is risky in the sense that they are unplanned and spontaneous and change the social dynamics of a situation. Given that the leaders of the networks emphasise their charismatic giftings and believe themselves to be called and empowered by God for the tasks they perform, their extraverted personalities are an asset. We do not say that leaders in these churches prophesy or pray for the sick because they are extraverted but only that, being

extraverted, they find it easier to act in such ways than introverts would.

Third, there remain significant differences between the psychological type profile of male leaders within the apostolic networks and the psychological type profile of men in general. These church leaders differ from the male population in terms of all four sets of binary functions. The leaders within the apostolic networks were more extraverted, more intuitive, more feeling, and more judging. In three ways leaders within the apostolic networks differ from the profile of men in general in precisely the same direction as that modelled by Anglican clergymen. In both groups the call to leadership and the vocation to ministry are associated with intuition, with feeling, and with judging. The bias toward intuition is consistent with the view that the religious vocation is concerned with a grasp of the transcendental, with a vision for future possibilities and for human transformation, and with the big picture shaped by things unseen. The bias toward feeling is consistent with the view that the religious vocation is concerned with valuing human relationships, with the concern for good interpersonal relationships, and with the goals of harmony and peace among the people of God. The bias toward judging is consistent with the view that the religious vocation is concerned with a disciplined and organised approach to daily living, with a regular pattern of study and prayer, and with responding to a God who is seen to be steadfast, consistent and predictable.

Fourth, the data provided further insight into the opportunities and challenges facing Christian ministry and mission in the UK today. The theological position with which the present study opened claims that introverts and extraverts are equally made in the image of God, that sensors and intuitives are equally made in the image of God, that thinkers and feelers are equally made in the image of God, and that judgers and perceivers are equally made in the image of God. The empirical evidence generated by a series of studies suggests that introverts and extraverts may be called into ministry, but within different streams of the



Christian Church. While Anglican ministry may work most effectively in an introverted style, ministers within the apostolic networks may work most effectively in an extraverted style. In other words, these two distinctive ministries may complement one another and, in so doing, their shared ministry may be effective in extending the outreach of the Church as a whole. At the same time, the empirical evidence suggests that some types, specifically sensors, thinkers and perceivers are less likely to be evidenced among church leaders (in this case either Anglican or apostolic networks). By implication the Churches collectively may experience greater difficulty in extending their ministry and mission among sensors, thinkers and perceivers. As the Churches in the UK continue to attempt to extend their reach among the ‘unchurched’, through ‘fresh expressions of church’ (Church of England, 2004; Croft and Mobsby, 2009), so they might be well advised to consider ways in which fresh expressions of Church may need to be reflected in fresh expressions of ministry. This could mean deliberately expanding the range of psychological types routinely recommended for training for ministry and for holding authorised ministry positions.

### References

- Baab, L. M. (1998). *Personality type in congregations: How to work with others more effectively*. Washington, DC: Alban Institute.
- Butler, A. (1999). *Personality and communicating the gospel*. Cambridge: Grove Books.
- Church of England (2004). *Mission shaped church*. London: Church House Publishing.
- Craig, C.L., Duncan, B., & Francis, L.J. (2006). Psychological type preferences of Roman Catholic priests in the United Kingdom. *Journal of Beliefs and Values*, 27, 157-164.
- Craig, C., Francis, L.J., & Robbins, M. (2004). Psychological type and sex differences among church leaders in the United Kingdom. *Journal of Beliefs and Values*, 25, 3-13.
- Craig, C. L., Horsfall, T., & Francis, L. J. (2005). Psychological types of male missionary personnel training in England: A role for thinking type men? *Pastoral Psychology*, 53, 475-482.
- Coft, S., & Mobsby, I. (2009). *Ancient faith future mission: Fresh expressions in the sacramental traditions*. Norwich: Canterbury Press.
- Duncan, B. (1993). *Pray your way: Your personality and God*. London: Darton, Longman and Todd.
- Edwards, L. (1993). *How we belong, fight and pray: The MBTI as a key to congregational dynamics*. Washington, DC: Alban Institute.
- Francis, L. J. (2005). *Faith and psychology: Personality, religion and the individual*. London: Darton, Longman and Todd.
- Francis, L.J., & Atkins, P. (2000). *Exploring Luke's Gospel: A guide to the gospel readings in the Revised Common Lectionary*. London: Mowbray.
- Francis, L.J., & Atkins, P. (2001). *Exploring Matthew's Gospel: A guide to the gospel readings in the Revised Common Lectionary*. London: Mowbray.
- Francis, L.J., & Atkins, P. (2002). *Exploring Mark's Gospel: An aid for readers and*

*preachers using year B of the Revised Common Lectionary*. London: Continuum.

Francis, L.J., Craig, C.L., & Butler, A. (2007). Psychological types of male evangelical Anglican seminarians in England. *Journal of Psychological Type*, 67, 11-17.

Francis, L.J., Craig, C.L., & Hall, G. (2008). Psychological type and attitude towards Celtic Christianity among committed churchgoers in the United Kingdom: An empirical study. *Journal of Contemporary Religion*, 23, 181-191.

Francis, L. J., Craig, C. L., Horsfall, T., & and Ross, C. F. J. (2005). Psychological types of male and female evangelical lay church leaders in England, compared with United Kingdom population norms. *Fieldwork in Religion*, 1, 69-83.

Francis, L. J., Craig, C. L., Whinney, M., Tilley, D., & Slater, P. (2007). Psychological profiling of Anglican clergy in England: Employing Jungian typology to interpret diversity, strengths, and potential weaknesses in ministry. *International Journal of Practical Theology*, 11, 266-284.

Francis, L. J., Gubb, S., & Robbins, M. (1999). Psychological type profile of Lead Elders within the Newfrontiers network of churches in the United Kingdom. *Journal of Beliefs and Values*, 30, 61-69.

Francis, L.J., Nash, P., Nash, S., & Craig, C.L. (2007). Psychology and youth ministry: Psychological type preferences of Christian youth workers in the United Kingdom. *Journal of Youth Ministry*, 5(2), 73-90.

Francis, L. J., Payne, V. J., & Jones, S. H. (2001). Psychological types of male Anglican clergy in Wales. *Journal of Psychological Type*, 56, 19-23.

Francis, L.J., Penson, A.W., & Jones, S.H. (2001). Psychological types of male and female Bible College students in England. *Mental Health, Religion and Culture*, 4, 23-32.

Francis, L.J. & Robbins, M. (2002). Psychological types of male evangelical church leaders. *Journal of Belief and Values*, 23, 217-220.

- Francis, L.J., Robbins, M., Duncan, B., Whinney, M., & Ross, C., (in press). Confirming the psychological type profile of Anglican clergymen in England: A ministry for intuitives.
- Francis, L.J., & Village, A. (2008). *Preaching with all our souls: A study in hermeneutics and psychological type*. London: Continuum.
- Goldsmith, M., & Wharton, M. (1993), *Knowing me knowing you*. London: SPCK.
- Irvine, A. R. (1989). Isolation and the parish ministry. Unpublished PhD dissertation, University of St Andrews.
- Jung, C. G. (1971). *Psychological types: The collected works, volume 6*. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul.
- Kay, W. K. (2000), *Pentecostals in Britain*, Carlisle: Paternoster.
- Kay, W. K. (2001), *Personality and Renewal*, Cambridge, Grove.
- Kay, W. K. (2002). Sociology of British Pentecostal and Charismatic Movements. In S. Burgess and E Van der Maas (Eds.), *New international dictionary of Pentecostal and Charismatic Movements* (2nd edn) (pp 1080-1083). Grand Rapids, Michigan: Zondervan.
- Kay, W. K. (2007). *Apostolic networks in Britain: New ways of being church*. Milton Keynes: Paternoster.
- Kay, W. K. (2008). Apostolic networks in Britain: An analytic overview. *Transformation*, 25(1), 32-42.
- Kay, W. K. (2009). *Pentecostalism (core text)*. London: SCM.
- Kay, W. K., & Francis, L. J. (2008). Psychological type preferences of female Bible College students in England. *Journal of Beliefs and Values*, 29, 101-105.
- Kay, W. K., Francis, L. J., & Craig, C. L. (2008). Psychological type preferences of male British Assemblies of God Bible College students: Tough minded or tender hearted? *Journal of the European Pentecostal Theological Association*, 28, 6-20.
- Keating, C. J. (1987). *Who we are is how we pray: Matching personality and spirituality*.

Mystic, Connecticut: Twenty-Third Publications.

Keirsey, D., & Bates, M. (1978). *Please understand me*. Del Mar, California: Prometheus Nemesis.

Kendall, E. (1998). *Myers-Briggs type indicator: Step 1 manual supplement*. Palo Alto, California: Consulting Psychologists Press.

Michael, C. P., & Norrissey, M. C. (1984). *Prayer and temperament: Different prayer forms for different personality types*. Charlottesville, Virginia: The Open Door.

Myers, I. B., & McCaulley, M. H. (1985). *Manual: A guide to the development and use of the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator*. Palo Alto, California: Consulting Psychologists Press.

Oswald, R.M., & Kroeger, O. (1988). *Personality type and religious leadership*. Washington, DC: The Alban Institute.

Ryland, A., Francis, L. J., & Robbins, M. (in press). Called for leadership: Psychological type profile of leaders within the Newfrontiers network of churches in the United Kingdom.

Table 1

*Type distribution for male leaders within the apostolic networks, compared with Anglican clergymen*

$N = 164$  (NB + = 1% of  $N$ )

The Sixteen Complete Types								Dichotomous Preferences											
<b>ISTJ</b> <i>n</i> = 18 (11.0%) <i>I</i> = 1.11 +++++ +++++ +				<b>ISFJ</b> <i>n</i> = 13 (7.9%) <i>I</i> = 1.01 +++++ ++++				<b>INFJ</b> <i>n</i> = 6 (3.7%) <i>I</i> = 0.40* ++++				<b>INTJ</b> <i>n</i> = 0 (0.0%) <i>I</i> = 0.0***				E <i>n</i> = 115 (70.1%) *** <i>I</i> = 1.63 I <i>n</i> = 49 (29.9%) *** <i>I</i> = 0.53  S <i>n</i> = 83 (50.6%) ** <i>I</i> = 1.32 N <i>n</i> = 81 (49.4%) ** <i>I</i> = 0.80  T <i>n</i> = 79 (48.2%) <i>I</i> = 1.04 F <i>n</i> = 85 (51.8%) <i>I</i> = 0.97  J <i>n</i> = 119 (72.6%) <i>I</i> = 1.06 P <i>n</i> = 45 (27.4%) <i>I</i> = 0.86			
<b>ISTP</b> <i>n</i> = 3 (1.8%) <i>I</i> = 0.82 ++				<b>ISFP</b> <i>n</i> = 3 (1.8%) <i>I</i> = 1.27 ++				<b>INFP</b> <i>n</i> = 3 (1.8%) <i>I</i> = 0.18*** ++				<b>INTP</b> <i>n</i> = 3 (1.8%) <i>I</i> = 0.35 ++				<b>Pairs and Temperaments</b>  IJ <i>n</i> = 37 (22.6%) *** <i>I</i> = 0.60 IP <i>n</i> = 12 ( 7.3%) *** <i>I</i> = 0.38 EP <i>n</i> = 33 (20.1%) * <i>I</i> = 1.57 EJ <i>n</i> = 82 (50.0%) *** <i>I</i> = 1.65  ST <i>n</i> = 47 (28.7%) * <i>I</i> = 1.45 SF <i>n</i> = 36 (22.0%) <i>I</i> = 1.18 NF <i>n</i> = 49 (29.9%) <i>I</i> = 0.85 NT <i>n</i> = 32 (19.5%) <i>I</i> = 0.73  SJ <i>n</i> = 69 (42.1%) ** <i>I</i> = 1.35 SP <i>n</i> = 14 ( 8.5%) <i>I</i> = 1.19 NP <i>n</i> = 31 (18.9%) <i>I</i> = 0.77 NJ <i>n</i> = 50 (30.5%) <i>I</i> = 0.82  TJ <i>n</i> = 59 (36.0%) <i>I</i> = 1.02 TP <i>n</i> = 20 (12.5%) <i>I</i> = 1.09 FP <i>n</i> = 25 (15.2%) <i>I</i> = 0.74 FJ <i>n</i> = 60 (36.6%) <i>I</i> = 1.11  IN <i>n</i> = 12 ( 7.3%) *** <i>I</i> = 0.21 EN <i>n</i> = 69 (42.1%) *** <i>I</i> = 1.61 IS <i>n</i> = 37 (22.6%) <i>I</i> = 1.05 ES <i>n</i> = 46 (28.0%) *** <i>I</i> = 1.66  ET <i>n</i> = 55 (33.5%) *** <i>I</i> = 1.86 EF <i>n</i> = 60 (36.6%) *** <i>I</i> = 1.46 IF <i>n</i> = 25 (15.2%) *** <i>I</i> = 0.54 IT <i>n</i> = 24 (14.6%) *** <i>I</i> = 0.51			
<b>ESTP</b> <i>n</i> = 5 (3.0%) <i>I</i> = 2.73 +++				<b>ESFP</b> <i>n</i> = 3 (1.8%) <i>I</i> = 0.76 ++				<b>ENFP</b> <i>n</i> = 16 (9.8%) <i>I</i> = 1.45 +++++ +++++				<b>ENTP</b> <i>n</i> = 9 (5.5%) <i>I</i> = 2.15 +++++ +							
<b>ESTJ</b> <i>n</i> = 21 (12.8%) <i>I</i> = 1.96** +++++ +++++ +++				<b>ESFJ</b> <i>n</i> = 17 (10.4%) <i>I</i> = 1.51 +++++ +++++				<b>ENFJ</b> <i>n</i> = 24 (14.6%) <i>I</i> = 1.61* +++++ +++++ +++++				<b>ENTJ</b> <i>n</i> = 20 (12.2%) <i>I</i> = 1.56 +++++ +++++ ++							
Jungian Types (E)				Jungian Types (I)				Dominant Types				<i>W K Kay, L J Francis, and M Robbins. Male apostolic network leaders.</i>							
	<i>n</i>	%	<i>I</i>		<i>n</i>	%	<i>I</i>		<i>n</i>	%	<i>I</i>								
E-TJ	41	25.0	1.74***	I-TP	6	3.7	0.49	Dt. T	47	28.7	1.31								
E-FJ	41	25.0	1.57**	I-FP	6	3.7	0.32**	Dt. F	47	28.7	1.04								
ES-P	8	4.9	1.39	IS-J	31	18.9	1.07	Dt. S	39	23.8	1.12								
EN-P	25	15.2	1.65*	IN-J	6	3.7	0.18***	Dt. N	31	18.9	0.64**								

Table 2

*Type distribution for male leaders within the apostolic networks, compared with the United Kingdom population norms*

$N = 164$  (NB + = 1% of  $N$ )

The Sixteen Complete Types								Dichotomous Preferences															
<b>ISTJ</b> <i>n</i> = 18 (11.0%) <i>I</i> = 0.56** +++++ +++++ +				<b>ISFJ</b> <i>n</i> = 13 (7.9%) <i>I</i> = 1.14 +++++ ++++				<b>INFJ</b> <i>n</i> = 6 (3.7%) <i>I</i> = 2.28 ++++				<b>INTJ</b> <i>n</i> = 0 (0.0%) <i>I</i> = 0.0				E I  S N  T F  J P	<i>n</i> = 115 <i>n</i> = 49  <i>n</i> = 83 <i>n</i> = 81  <i>n</i> = 79 <i>n</i> = 85  <i>n</i> = 119 <i>n</i> = 45	(70.1%) (29.9%)  (50.6%) (49.4%)  (48.2%) (51.8%)  (72.6%) (27.4%)	*** <i>I</i> = 1.49 *** <i>I</i> = 0.56  *** <i>I</i> = 0.69 *** <i>I</i> = 1.84  *** <i>I</i> = 0.74 *** <i>I</i> = 1.47  *** <i>I</i> = 1.33 *** <i>I</i> = 0.61				
<b>ISTP</b> <i>n</i> = 3 (1.8%) <i>I</i> = 0.17*** ++				<b>ISFP</b> <i>n</i> = 3 (1.8%) <i>I</i> = 4.9 ++				<b>INFP</b> <i>n</i> = 3 (1.8%) <i>I</i> = 0.51 ++				<b>INTP</b> <i>n</i> = 3 (1.8%) <i>I</i> = 0.44 ++				<b>Pairs and Temperaments</b>							
																IJ IP EP EJ	<i>n</i> = 37 <i>n</i> = 12 <i>n</i> = 33 <i>n</i> = 82	(22.6%) ( 7.3%) (20.1%) (50.0%)	* <i>I</i> = 0.73 *** <i>I</i> = 0.33 <i>I</i> = 0.88 *** <i>I</i> = 2.09				
																ST SF NF NT	<i>n</i> = 47 <i>n</i> = 36 <i>n</i> = 49 <i>n</i> = 32	(28.7%) (22.0%) (29.9%) (19.5%)	*** <i>I</i> = 0.57 <i>I</i> = 0.96 *** <i>I</i> = 2.43 <i>I</i> = 1.34				
<b>ESTP</b> <i>n</i> = 5 (3.0%) <i>I</i> = 0.37* +++				<b>ESFP</b> <i>n</i> = 3 (1.8%) <i>I</i> = 0.30* ++				<b>ENFP</b> <i>n</i> = 16 (9.8%) <i>I</i> = 1.92* +++++ +++++				<b>ENTP</b> <i>n</i> = 9 (5.5%) <i>I</i> = 1.52 +++++ +				SJ SP NP NJ				<i>n</i> = 69 <i>n</i> = 14 <i>n</i> = 31 <i>n</i> = 50	(42.1%) ( 8.5%) (18.9%) (30.5%)	<i>I</i> = 0.95 *** <i>I</i> = 0.30 <i>I</i> = 1.15 *** <i>I</i> = 2.92	
																TJ TP FP FJ	<i>n</i> = 59 <i>n</i> = 20 <i>n</i> = 25 <i>n</i> = 60	( 36.0%) ( 12.5%) (15.2%) (36.6%)	<i>I</i> = 0.94 *** <i>I</i> = 0.46 <i>I</i> = 0.82 *** <i>I</i> = 2.21				
<b>ESTJ</b> <i>n</i> = 21 (12.8%) <i>I</i> = 1.10 +++++ +++++ +++				<b>ESFJ</b> <i>n</i> = 17 (10.4%) <i>I</i> = 1.72* +++++ +++++ ++++				<b>ENFJ</b> <i>n</i> = 24 (14.6%) <i>I</i> = 7.30*** +++++ +++++ +++++				<b>ENTJ</b> <i>n</i> = 20 (12.2%) <i>I</i> = 2.85*** +++++ +++++ ++				IN EN IS ES				<i>n</i> = 12 <i>n</i> = 69 <i>n</i> = 37 <i>n</i> = 46	( 7.3%) (42.1%) (22.6%) (28.0%)	<i>I</i> = 0.61 *** <i>I</i> = 2.81 *** <i>I</i> = 0.55 <i>I</i> = 0.88	
																ET EF IF IT	<i>n</i> = 55 <i>n</i> = 60 <i>n</i> = 25 <i>n</i> = 24	( 33.5%) (36.6%) (15.2%) (14.6%)	<i>I</i> = 1.21 *** <i>I</i> = 1.90 <i>I</i> = 0.96 *** <i>I</i> = 0.39				
Jungian Types (E)				Jungian Types (I)				Dominant Types															
	<i>n</i>	%	<i>I</i>		<i>n</i>	%	<i>I</i>		<i>n</i>	%	<i>I</i>		<i>n</i>	%	<i>I</i>								
E-TJ	41	25.0	1.57**	I-TP	6	3.7	0.24***	Dt. T	47	28.7	0.93												
E-FJ	41	25.0	3.12***	I-FP	6	3.7	0.50	Dt. F	47	28.7	1.86***												
ES-P	8	4.9	0.34***	IS-J	31	18.9	0.71*	Dt. S	39	23.8	0.58***												
EN-P	25	15.2	1.75**	IN-J	6	3.7	0.88	Dt. N	31	18.9	1.47*												

W K Kay, L J Francis,  
and M Robbins.  
Male apostolic  
network leaders.